

will not be able to do this in 4 minutes. Other colleagues have spoken.

Mr. HARKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I understand the Senator requested when we come back at 2:15 p.m. that he be recognized to continue to speak on his amendment. The amendment has been laid down; is that correct?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I modify that unanimous consent request to ask unanimous consent that when the Senator finishes speaking on his amendment, Senator BINGAMAN be allowed to then offer his amendment at this point in time.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the sequencing suggested by the Senator from Iowa is fine. That will move the bill along. The Senator from Minnesota has laid down his amendment. We have a number of amendments pending at the present time. Subject to the wishes of the majority leader, it is our hope to vote late this afternoon on a number of amendments. That sequencing, as articulated by Senator HARKIN, is fine.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to both of my colleagues, I appreciate there are a number of amendments. I will take time just to make sure colleagues know what this amendment is about. I do not intend to take a long time on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, having been a teacher for years, in 1 minute I do not know how to summarize an amendment that is all about education and kids.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:27 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 2001—continued

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 3631

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator from Minnesota be interested in entering into a time agreement on his amendment?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague, I do not think it will probably be necessary. At least on my part, I think within a half an hour I can make my case for the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. If the Senator is agreeable, we agree that his amendment will be debated for 45 minutes, 30 minutes to his side and 15 minutes in opposition.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I would be pleased to accommodate my colleague.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that that be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from New Hampshire, I would like to send an amendment to the desk that I ask be laid aside, if I could.

Mr. GREGG. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. WELLSTONE. This is just an amendment to be filed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be numbered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. If I could clarify—

Mr. GREGG. Reserving the right to object, are you requesting there be no second degrees?

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is correct.

Mr. GREGG. Or you just filed one?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Yes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota that there be no second degrees to his amendment as part of the language which was just agreed to relative to the timeframe on his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President and colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—just for a little bit of context for this amendment, this amendment deals with an increase in funding not to where we should be but at least a step forward for the title I program.

When the HELP Committee authorized the title I program, we actually voted to increase the authorization of title I to \$15 billion. The interesting thing is that every Democrat and every Republican on the HELP Committee supported this increase. Every Demo-

crat and every Republican supported the increase to authorize up to \$15 billion.

As a matter of fact, during the floor debate on May 1, the majority leader himself, Senator LOTT, said:

This is a \$15 billion reauthorization bill. Good work has been done by this committee.

We have a budget resolution that doesn't work. We are not able to adequately fund important priorities. Given the emphasis on tax cuts, given the significant allocation of money for the Pentagon, we have robbed ourselves of our capacity to invest in children and in education.

What this amendment does is essentially say that the appropriation would go from \$8.36 billion for title I up to \$10 billion for title I. Right now, all we have in this appropriations bill is a \$400 million increase, when the HELP Committee authorized \$15 billion. We are trying to bump up the appropriation so we can do better for our children.

What I was saying on the floor earlier is important: The title I program is one of the heart-and-soul Federal programs. This is targeted money that goes to primarily low- and moderate-income communities and low- and moderate-income students. It is assistance for the schools and the school districts for more reading instruction, for afterschool programs, for prekindergarten programs, for more teaching assistance. It is a very important program. The title I program has made a difference, even as severely underfunded as it is.

One of the reasons I bring this amendment to the floor—I have continued, week after week, month after month, it seems year after year, to come to the floor and talk about the need to provide more funding for the title I program—is that right now this program is funded, maybe, at the 30–35 percent level, so that 65 or 70 percent of the children who could benefit don't benefit. These children come from primarily low-income families. These are kids who have been severely disadvantaged. We are trying to give these schools and the teachers and, most importantly, the children some additional help so they can do better.

In my State of Minnesota, for example, typically the situation is that if a school has less than 65 percent of the students on a free or reduced school lunch program—say it is only 60 percent—there is no money for the school because we have run out of the money. We have run out of financial assistance.

The HELP Committee Democrats and Republicans are on record saying we ought to authorize this to \$15 billion. The majority leader came out and said: Authorize the \$15 billion; good work. But we have a budget resolution that has so constrained the work of appropriators that we have not made the investment in education. This is precisely the opposite direction of where